

REMARKS

In response to the non-final Office action of December 7, 2006, applicants ask that all claims be allowed in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-11, 14, 15, 19-24 and 28-55 are pending, of which claims 1, 14, 20, 21, and 44 are independent. Claims 1, 14, 15, 20, 21, 24, 28, 32, 36-40, and 49-54 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 1-11, 14, 15, 19-21, 28-39, 49-52, and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, claims 1, 14, 20, and 21 have been amended. The amendments are believed to address all of the Examiner's concerns. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1, 3, 8-11, 14, 19-24, 28-43, and 49-55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertram (U.S. Patent No. 5,818,446) in view of Hoyle (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,010), Alexa ("Alexa Internet and Netscape Team to Provide Related Sites To Support Smart Browsing"), and Furst (U.S. Patent No. 6,297,819). Regarding the rejection of independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Bertram, Hoyle, Alexa, Furst, nor any proper combination of the references, describes or properly suggests all of the features of independent claim 1.

For example, independent claim 1 is directed to a web browser that includes, inter alia, a chrome display program configured to receive chrome specifiers associated with the current web site, where the chrome specifiers cause the chrome display program to add a new control element to the chrome being displayed on a chrome portion of a browser display while maintaining at least one element of the chrome that was displayed prior to the addition of the new control element. The new control element is configured to invoke functionality related to the current web site being displayed.

Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 because neither Bertram, Hoyle, Alexa, Furst, nor any proper combination of the references, describes or suggests at least these features of independent claim 1. The Office Action appears to rely on a combination of Alexa and Furst in rejecting these features of independent claim 1. See Office Action of December 7, 2006 at pages 5-6. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In particular, Alexa describes providing a targeted list of links to sites related to a website currently being rendered by a web browser. See Alexa at page 1, lines 5-18. In one aspect, Alexa describes that advertisements may be added to a toolbar displayed by the Alexa system. See Alexa at page 3, lines 20-25. Adding an advertisement to the Alexa toolbar, however, does not describe or suggest adding, to the chrome being displayed on a chrome portion of a browser display, a new control element that is configured to invoke functionality related to the current web site being displayed. Rather, the advertisement is merely a promotional message about a company sponsoring the advertisement. The advertisement is not configured to invoke any type of functionality, much less functionality related to the current web site. Moreover, the advertisement described in Alexa is not displayed on the chrome being displayed on a chrome portion of a browser display. Instead, the advertisement is displayed in the Alexa toolbar, which is provided in a separate window accompanying the browser and not part of chrome being displayed on a chrome portion of the browser display. See Alexa at page 10 ("The Alexa Service appears on your desktop in its own window"). Thus, Alexa fails to describe or suggest a chrome display program configured to receive chrome specifiers associated with the current web site, where the chrome specifiers cause the chrome display program to add a new control element that is configured to invoke functionality related to the current web site being displayed to the chrome being displayed on the chrome portion of the browser display while maintaining at least one control element of the chrome that was displayed prior to the addition of the new control element, as required by independent claim 1.

Furst describes an application delivery system that allows a user to select and enable component applications whose functionality becomes available to the user through a client program running on the user's computer system. See Furst at col. 2, lines 18-30. The application delivery system is premised on a client program that is separate from the web browser operating on the user's computer. See Furst at Fig. 1 (showing user's computer 120 having a web browser program 122 and a system client 124, where the tool bar 114 of Furst's application delivery system is separate from the web browser window 112) and col. 4, lines 16-21. As a consequence, Furst does not add a new control element to the chrome portion of a

browser, as recited by claim 1. Rather, as shown in Figs. 1 and 5, Furst describes displaying user interface elements or icons representing system and component application tools separate from the browser display. See Furst at col. 4, lines 25-37 and col. 8, lines 39-46. Therefore, Furst fails to describe or suggest a chrome display program configured to receive chrome specifiers associated with the current web site, where the chrome specifiers cause the chrome display program to add a new control element that is configured to invoke functionality related to the current web site being displayed to the chrome being displayed on the chrome portion of the browser display while maintaining at least one control element of the chrome that was displayed prior to the addition of the new control element, as required by independent claim 1.

Furthermore, no proper combination of Alexa and Furst describes or suggests a chrome display program configured to receive chrome specifiers associated with the current web site, where the chrome specifiers cause the chrome display program to add a new control element that is configured to invoke functionality related to the current web site being displayed to the chrome being displayed on the chrome portion of the browser display while maintaining at least one control element of the chrome that was displayed prior to the addition of the new control element. Specifically, assuming that a component application tool described in Furst is a control element that is configured to invoke functionality related to the current web site being displayed, no motivation exists for replacing the advertisement displayed in Alexa with an icon representing a component application tool. As discussed above, the advertisement is not a control element configured to invoke functionality and, therefore, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to replace the advertisement with such a control element. Furthermore, assuming a combination of Furst with Alexa is proper, the component application tool icons would properly be placed in a display area separate from the browser as described in Furst because nothing in Alexa suggests an alternative placement of the component application tool icons. Thus, no proper combination of Alexa and Furst describes or suggests a chrome display program configured to receive chrome specifiers associated with the current web site, where the chrome specifiers cause the chrome display program to add a new control element that is configured to invoke functionality related to the current web site being displayed to the chrome being

displayed on the chrome portion of the browser display while maintaining at least one control element of the chrome that was displayed prior to the addition of the new control element, as required by independent claim 1.

Moreover, the Office Action merely states in a conclusory manner that it would be obvious to combine Alexa into Furst "to provide different kinds of control elements for the user, since the combination would have allowed the user to access or perform information or functionality provided by the web site through user's browser interface." See Office Action at page 6. The Office Action has not provided any support for the motivation to combine Alexa and Furst in the manner suggested and Applicants submit that the conclusion is based on nothing more than impermissible hindsight obtained from reading Applicants' specification.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons described above, Applicants submit that neither Alexa, Furst, nor any proper combination of the two, describes or suggests a chrome display program configured to receive chrome specifiers associated with the current web site, where the chrome specifiers cause the chrome display program to add a new control element that is configured to invoke functionality related to the current web site being displayed to the chrome being displayed on the chrome portion of the browser display while maintaining at least one control element of the chrome that was displayed prior to the addition of the new control element, as required by independent claim 1.

Neither Bertram nor Hoyle remedy the deficiencies of Alexa and Furst. Specifically, the Office Action indicates that Bertram does not explicitly disclose a new control element that is configured in response to the current web site being rendered to invoke functionality offered by the current web site being rendered. See Office Action of December 7, 2006 at page 5. In addition, the Office Action does not rely on Hoyle in rejecting this feature, or any feature in claim 1, and Hoyle fails to describe or suggest these features for at least the reasons provided in previous comments. See, e.g., reply filed February 6, 2006 to Office Action of September 7, 2005 and reply filed March 17, 2005 to Office Action of December 17, 2004.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 1, along with its dependent claims 3, 8-11, 28-31, 49, 50, and 55, are allowable for at least the above reasons.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertram in view of Hoyle, Alexa, and Furst, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Bertram, Hoyle, Alexa, Furst, nor any proper combination of the references, describes or properly suggests all of the features of independent claim 14.

Specifically, claim 14 is directed to a web browser that, inter alia, includes a chrome display program that is configured to receive chrome specifiers associated with the current web site, wherein the chrome specifiers cause the chrome display program to add a control element configured to invoke functionality related to the current web site being displayed. The chrome display program is further configured to receive modified chrome specifiers, wherein the modified chrome specifiers cause the chrome display program to return the chrome to a default chrome. As described above, Bertram, Hoyle, Alexa, or Furst, alone or in the proposed combination, do not describe or suggest a chrome display program configured to receive chrome specifiers associated with the current web site, where the chrome specifiers cause the chrome display program to add a new control element that is configured to invoke functionality related to the current web site being displayed to the chrome being displayed on the chrome portion of the browser display. Therefore, Bertram, Hoyle, Alexa, or Furst, alone or in the proposed combination, also do not describe or suggest a chrome display program configured to receive chrome specifiers associated with the current web site, where the chrome specifiers cause the chrome display program to add a control element configured to invoke functionality related to the current web site being displayed, as recited in amended independent claim 14.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 14, along with its dependent claims 19 and 32-35, are allowable for at least the above reasons.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertram in view of Hoyle, Alexa, and Furst, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Bertram, Hoyle, Alexa, Furst, nor any proper combination of the references, describes or properly suggests all of the features of independent claim 20.

In particular, independent claim 20 is directed to a web browser program that, inter alia, includes a chrome display program configured to receive chrome specifiers associated with the

current web site, wherein the chrome specifiers cause the chrome display program to modify less than all of the control elements on the chrome being displayed on the chrome portion of the browser display and at least one modified control element is configured to invoke functionality related to the current web site being displayed. As described above, Bertram, Hoyle, Alexa, or Furst, alone or in the proposed combination, do not describe or suggest a chrome display program configured to receive chrome specifiers associated with the current web site, where the chrome specifiers cause the chrome display program to add a new control element that is configured to invoke functionality related to the current web site being displayed to the chrome being displayed on the chrome portion of the browser display. Therefore, Bertram, Hoyle, Alexa, or Furst, alone or in the proposed combination, also do not describe or suggest a chrome display program configured to receive chrome specifiers associated with the current web site, where the chrome specifiers cause the chrome display program to modify less than all of the control elements on the chrome being displayed on the chrome portion of the browser display and at least one modified control element is configured to invoke functionality related to the current web site being displayed, as recited in independent claim 20.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 20, along with its dependent claims 36-39, 51, and 52, are allowable for at least the above reasons.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertram in view of Hoyle, Alexa, and Furst, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Bertram, Hoyle, Alexa, Furst, nor any proper combination of the references, describes or properly suggests all of the features of independent claim 21.

For example, independent claim 21 is directed to a method for reconfiguring chrome of a user interface to a web browser program and recites, inter alia, adding a new control element to the chrome being displayed on the chrome portion of the browser display while maintaining at least one element of the chrome that was displayed prior to the addition of the new control element. As described above, Bertram, Hoyle, Alexa, or Furst, alone or in the proposed combination, do not describe or suggest a chrome display program configured to receive chrome specifiers associated with the current web site, where the chrome specifiers cause the chrome

display program to add a new control element that is configured to invoke functionality related to the current web site being displayed to the chrome being displayed on the chrome portion of the browser display while maintaining at least one control element of the chrome that was displayed prior to the addition of the new control element. Therefore, Bertram, Hoyle, Alexa, or Furst, alone or in the proposed combination, also do not describe or suggest adding a new control element that is configured to invoke functionality related to the current web site being displayed to the chrome being displayed on the chrome portion of the browser display while maintaining at least one control element of the chrome that was displayed prior to the addition of the new control element, as required by independent claim 21.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 21, along with its dependent claims 22-24, 40-43, 53, and 54, are allowable for at least the above reasons.

Claims 44-48 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertram in view of Alexa and Furst. Independent claim 44 is directed to a method for partially customizing chrome displayed as part of a user interface by adding a control element configured to enable selection of new functionality that is related to a current web resource being accessed. The method includes, inter alia, presenting on a chrome portion of a browser display, in addition to at least some of the set of selectable chrome elements, an additional selectable chrome element that is related to functionality offered by the web resource being accessed. The method also includes detecting navigation by the web browsing application to a first web resource and, in response to detected navigation to the first web resource, presenting on the chrome portion of the browser display, in addition to at least some of the set of selectable chrome elements, an additional and new selectable chrome element that is related to functionality offered by the first web resource being accessed. The method also includes detecting navigation by the web browsing application to a second web resource and, in response to detected navigation by the web browsing application to a second web resource, removing the additional and new selectable chrome element that is related to functionality offered by the first web resource.

As described above, Bertram, Alexa, or Furst, alone or in the proposed combination, do not describe or suggest a chrome display program configured to receive chrome specifiers

associated with the current web site, where the chrome specifiers cause the chrome display program to add a new control element that is configured to invoke functionality related to the current web site being displayed to the chrome being displayed on the chrome portion of the browser display while maintaining at least one control element of the chrome that was displayed prior to the addition of the new control element. Therefore, Bertram, Alexa, or Furst, alone or in the proposed combination, also do not describe or suggest presenting on the chrome portion of the browser display, in addition to at least some of the set of selectable chrome elements, an additional selectable chrome element that is related to functionality offered by the web resource being accessed and removing the chrome element upon detecting navigation to a second web resource, as recited in claim 44.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 44, along with its dependent claims 45-48, are allowable for at least the above reasons.

Claims 2, 4-7, and 15, which each depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertram in view of Hoyle, Alexa, and Furst in further view of one of Miller ("An Introduction to the Resource Description Framework," D-Lib Magazine, May 1998, pages 1-12), Peyer (U.S. Patent No. 6,188,401), Brown ("Using Netscape 2" published by Que Corporation 1995, page 74), and Alexa 2 ("Ad on the Bar Campaign Supplements Alexa's Focused Advertising Program," http://www.alexa.com/press/press_releases/ad.html, pages 1-3, published 12/10/1997).

None of Miller, Peyer, Brown, or Alexa 2 remedy the failure of Alexa, Hoyle, Bertram, and Furst, alone or in combination, to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 1. Therefore, neither Bertram, Hoyle, Alexa, Furst, Miller, Peyer, Brown, Alexa 2, nor any combination of the references, describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 2, 4-7, and 15 which depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, are allowable for at least the above reasons.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be

exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.


Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance.

No fees are believed to be due. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 061050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

3/7/07



Jeremy J. Monaldo
Reg. No. 58,680

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331